

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-68 are pending. The claims have not been amended. A listing of the claims as originally filed is presented for the examiner's convenience.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 15-20, 23-30, 33-36, 38-43, 46-53, 56-59, 61-66, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tonomura et al. (Patent No. 5,576,950).

Claims 8, 9, 31, 32, 54, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonomura et al. (Patent No. 5,576,950) in view of Perttunen et al. (Patent No. 5,939,699).

Claims 14, 37, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonomura et al. (Patent No. 5,576,950) in view of Knowles et al. (Patent No. 5,869,819)..

Claims 21, 22, 44, 45, 67, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonomura et al. (Patent No. 5,576,950) in view of Swaminathan et al. (Publication No. 2002/0066782).

SECTION 102 REJECTION OF INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 24, AND 47

Claim 1 recites a method.

Independent claim 24 recites a system comprising a processor and memory. The processor is operated according to the method recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 47 recites a computer program product. The program code includes code that causes a processor to operate according to the method recited in claim 1.

The following discussion is centered around limitations recited in claim 1. The remarks apply equally to independent claims 24 and 47.

1. “receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers...”

Claim 1 recites in part:

receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a first set of identifiers printed on the paper document

Fig. 12A and column 5, lines 22-31 of Tonomura were cited for teaching this limitation.

As best understood of the Office action, it appears the examiner relied on elements 42 (additional information) printed on paper 33 for teaching the recited “a first set of identifiers printed on the paper document”. The examiner relied on element 52 (scanner) for teaching the recited “receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers”.

Given these asserted teachings, the following remarks will reveal that Tonomura in fact does not teach the pending claims.

2. determining one or more time ranges based upon the one or more identifiers

Claim 1 further recites in part:

determining one or more time ranges based upon the one or more identifiers, each time range having a start time and an end time

Fig. 11 and column 12, lines 14-23 were cited for teaching this recited limitation.

Fig. 11 shows an image layout of Tonomura’s printing storage area 502 (Fig. 7). Elements 41 are representative images representative of events, arranged on paper 33 from left to right and top to bottom in time order of the events. *Col. 11, lines 56-61.*

Elements 42 are displays of additional information obtained when finding an event during the course image processing. *Col. 12, lines 14-16.* Examples of Tonomura’s additional information include time code, time width to the next image, change amount of the image. *Id, lines 17-19.* Fig. 12A shows an external appearance of an example of Tonomura’s system. The scanner 52 reads the additional information 42.

Fig. 10 explains the process of image access using the scanner 52 shown in Fig. 12A. Tonomura teaches at step S52 reading out the additional information by the scanner 52 (col. 13, lines 61-63). At step S56, a code is produced; e.g., an alphanumeric code from a bar code reader, or numeric characters from a keypad (col. 14, lines 8-14). The code contents are analyzed and displayed in steps S57 and S58.

With respect to claim 1, the claim substantively recites in part “receiving a selection of one or more identifiers and determining one or more time ranges based on the one or more identifiers.” None of the foregoing description teaches this claim limitation. Tonomura’s

production of alphanumeric code or numeric characters do not constitute determining one or more time ranges based on the one or more selected identifiers.

As best understood, Tonomura teaches that the code can be a video access/replay command, and contains video frame information and time information (col. 14, lines 26-32). However, there is no discussion of determining time ranges based on the one or more selected identifiers. The mere mention that the replay command contains “time information” can not be fairly construed to teach determining time ranges. More specifically, a replay command that contains time information does not teach determining time ranges based on one or more selected identifiers.

As best understood, Tonomura further teaches at column 14, lines 33-36, that the code can be a command for video/sound replay for “a short time from the time of event detection.”¹ This does not teach determining time ranges. As best understood, “a short time from the time of event detection” teaches that the video/sound is played beginning a the time of event detection for a short time; i.e., the video player advances to the “time of event detection” and then performs playback for “a short time.” There is no determination of time ranges, and more specifically, there is no determination of time ranges based on the one or more selected identifiers.

Tonomura does not teach:

receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a first set of identifiers printed on the paper document ... [and]

determining one or more time ranges based upon the one or more identifiers, each time range having a start time and an end time

For these reasons alone, the Section 102 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome. The claims depending from claim 1 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 1.

¹ The images 41 printed on the paper 33 are images of “events” that are detected by Tonomura’s system. See the discussion at column 4, lines 61-67. The “time of event detection”, as understood, means the time at which the event was detected.

The Section 102 rejection of independent claim 24 is believed to be overcome for the same reason set forth above for claim 1. The claims depending from independent claim 24 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 24.

The Section 102 rejection of independent claim 47 is believed to be overcome for the same reason set forth above for claim 1. The claims depending from independent claim 47 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 47.

3. determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges

Claim 1 further recites in part:

determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges

As discussed above, Tonomura teaches at column 14, lines 33-36, that the code can be a command for video/sound replay for “a short time from the time of event detection.” This does not constitute “determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges” as recited in claim 1.

As understood, Tonomura plays back video/sound from a given point in time “for a short time.” This is not the same as “determining portions of the recorded information.” There is no determination of a portion of video taking place when one performs playback of the video. The video is simply played back (in this case for a short time). By contrast, claim 1 clearly recites the limitation of determining a portion of the recorded information.

Moreover, as discussed above, since Tonomura does not teach determining time ranges, Tonomura can not be interpreted as teaching determining a portion of the recorded information based on the one or more time ranges.

Tonomura does not teach:

receiving information indicative of selection of one or more identifiers from a first set of identifiers printed on the paper document ...

determining one or more time ranges based upon the one or more identifiers, each time range having a start time and an end time ... [and]

determining portions of the recorded information corresponding to the one or more time ranges

For these reasons alone, the Section 102 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome. The claims depending from claim 1 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 1.

The Section 102 rejection of independent claim 24 is believed to be overcome for the same reason set forth above for claim 1. The claims depending from independent claim 24 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 24.

The Section 102 rejection of independent claim 47 is believed to be overcome for the same reason set forth above for claim 1. The claims depending from independent claim 47 are believed to be allowable based on the allowability of base claim 47.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:jis
61024846 v1